NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MEHENDRA NARAYAN CHAND PEDDY, Petitioner, v. MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 07-71856 Agency No. A78-673-835 MEMORANDUM[*]

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted May 20, 2008[**]

Before: PREGERSON, TASHIMA, and GOULD, Circuit Judges.

Mehendra Narayan Chand Peddy, a native and citizen of Fiji, petitions for

review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an

immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum,

---

[*]   This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

[**]   The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

evidence, *Singh v. INS*, 134 F.3d 962, 966 (9th Cir. 1998), and we deny the

petition.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's conclusion that the single robbery and

minor injuries that Peddy suffered in Fiji did not rise to the level of persecution.

See id. at 967-69. Further, substantial evidence supports the IJ's conclusion that

Peddy does not have a well-founded fear of future persecution, because he failed to

demonstrate the requisite individualized risk of persecution. *See id.* at 970-71.

Accordingly, Peddy's asylum claim fails.

Because Peddy failed to satisfy the lower standard of proof for asylum, it

necessarily follows that he failed to satisfy the more stringent standard for

withholding of removal. *See id.* at 971.

Finally, because Peddy has not shown that it is more likely than not that he

will be tortured if he returned to Fiji, substantial evidence supports the IJ's denial

of CAT relief. *See Malhi v. INS*, 336 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.